









It is feared that the American shipwreck, overdue at San Francisco, has been lost.

The *Paris Figaro*, commenting in a remarkable temperate and non-objectionable strain on the resignation of Prince Bismarck and the probable disappearance from the political stage of the potent figure of the man of "blood and iron," tells a very good story of Napoleon I. "That conqueror, when at the height of his power—say in 1809—turned suddenly one day at the Tuileries to a grandson of his court, and put to him this strange question: 'Voulez-vous disparaître soudainement—demain, ce que vous diriez?' There is much virtue in the Gallic 'Ouf,' which has nothing to do with our 'out bird.' 'Ouf!' is a long-drawn suspiration, expressive of infinite relief after a protracted continuity of oppression. The sailor in the presentable might have been expected to mutter 'out!' when he got the Old Man of the Sea at his shoulders; and all Europe was in the blessed condition of being able to cry 'out!' when Napoleon himself, after Waterloo, was quietly shipped off to St. Helena. Now, Prince Bismarck is no doubt an illustrious statesman and a mighty ruler of men; yet, for all that, it is just possible that a good many millions of 'oufs' deep, if not loud, well-heated—not exclusively on the French side of the Rhine—when the terrible Bismarck finally retired into private life—*Strait Times* London letter.

#### THE MAGISTRATE'S BILL.

The Legislative Council met this afternoon to consider the Magistrate's Bill in committee. There were present: His Excellency the Officer Administering the Government, Hon. F. Fleming, Hon. W. M. Dunn, Acting Colonial Secretary, Hon. W. M. Goodman, Attorney General, Hon. Samuel Brown, Surveyor General, Hon. G. A. Mitchell-Innes, Acting Registrar General, Hon. Ho Kai.

With regard to section 8, which, it was suggested, might limit the power of the Marine Magistrate to the trial of cases of assault, the Attorney General said this was not the intention, and he proposed the addition of the words "without prejudice to any other jurisdiction or authority possessed by him."

In reference to section 17, dealing with the issuing of summonses and warrants, the Attorney General proposed that the words "and that a reasonable sum was paid or tendered to him (the witness) for his costs or expenses in that behalf" be added, "where in the opinion of the Magistrate necessary." It was not always necessary, he said, to pay a witness.

His Excellency asked Dr. Ho Kai if he pressed the objection he made at the last meeting with regard to section 17. Dr. Ho Kai said that he wished to point out that no time was allowed in the case of a witness the summons for whom was not served personally, but at his house. He might not return to his house for several hours, and it steps were taken against him because he did not attend at the Magistrate's office, the witness might suffer a hardship.

The Attorney General said the provision was the same as in the *Magistrate's Bill*, and no complaint of hardship had been made. After some discussion it was agreed, in the form relating to this section, to require that the time when the summons was served be noted, so that the Magistrate might know if a witness had a good excuse for not attending at the trial.

Attention was drawn at the meeting to the 3rd clause of Section 33, which, by giving the Magistrate a general power to substitute fine for imprisonment, was at variance with a recent enabling ordinance which provided imprisonment without the option of a fine for certain offences. The Attorney General, referring to section 47 which deals with "security for good behaviour," said it did not provide for the retention of the power which the magistrates had at present, of requiring a defendant to enter into recognisances whether he was convicted or not. He thought the power was a somewhat dangerous one.

Mr. Mitchell-Innes said this power was often exercised, and he thought the magistrates would regret its withdrawal as it was a very convenient mode of dealing with some Chinese cases. The whole procedure of the Chinese Courts turned upon the principal of making one man stand as surety for another.

The Attorney General then proposed to alter the section to read: "In all cases punishable on summary conviction, the Magistrate may, whether the defendant is convicted or not, order the defendant to enter into recognisances with two sufficient sureties for his good behaviour."

Dr. Ho Kai thought the section absurd on the face of it, as it gave the Magistrate power to punish a man whether there was any conviction or not.

The Colonial Secretary said that power had existed since 1844. When a disturbance on an extensive scale took place the Magistrate often bound over some people under the likelihood of a renewal of the disturbance was removed.

The clause was ultimately passed in this form: "In all cases punishable on summary conviction the Magistrate may, if he shall so think proper, and whether the defendant shall be convicted or not, &c."

In regard to section 58, which gives the Magistrate power to award costs, recoverable by distress.

Dr. Ho Kai objected to the clause unless the costs were limited to actual amount. The Attorney General consented to the limitation of the amount to \$5, and the clause passed.

Having reached Part IV of the bill, the Council adjourned till Friday, at 3 p.m.

The man who loses is never accused of not playing fair. *—Athenian Globe.*

The photograph is not one of those things which 'goes without saying.' *—Binghamton Leader.*

A Bostonian never uses the phrase 'Come off it, you!' says 'Vasote the monster.' *—Washington Post.*

Her face would stop a clock; 'tis true, 'Tis a face so passing fair That even time must pause to view The beauty that's imparted there. *—Washington Post.*

#### THE ATTEMPTED MURDER OF A POLICEMAN.

Wong Tak Shing, who describes himself as a cook, was brought before Mr. Robinson in the Police Court to-day on remand, charged with shooting a Police Constable with intent to murder him.

Police Constable John Green said:—At 8 p.m. on the 28th April I was on duty at Tai-kok-lau, British Kowloon. I saw the defendant and another man (who has made his escape) coming towards me, each carrying a bundle. When they came up to me I spoke to the defendant who was on my left, and asked him what he had in his bundle. As I did so the man on my right struck me on the right side. I seized the defendant and we fell together to the ground. Just as we fell together to the ground, the prisoner had a revolver in his hand (I think it must have been in his sleeve before) and in the act of falling he fired a shot which grazed my right temple and then passed through the brim of my forage cap. As soon as we fell to the ground the other man struck me again, this time with something hard. I think it must have been a stick. The blow was on the back, and did not hurt me. I wrenched the revolver from the prisoner and seized him by the throat. I then turned to try and shoot the other man who was kicking me. I fired one shot, and then he ran. As he ran I fired another shot. I missed him both times. He ran in the direction of Tai-kok-lau. On looking at the defendant again I saw by the light of the moon, which had come out just then, that he had another revolver in his hand, a larger one than the first. I immediately threw away the first revolver and placing my knee on the prisoner's chest I wrenched the second revolver from him. Both revolvers were fully loaded at the time I seized them. I then took defendant to Yau-mai Police Station. He was bleeding from the head. I don't know from what cause. I may have hit him with the revolver while struggling. At the station he was searched in my presence, and in his possession were found 21 rounds of ammunition, fifty-seven dollars and seventy pieces of broken silver. There were also found a pair of earrings, two silver chains with toothpicks, an enamelled tray and four pounce jackets.

Several Chinese witnesses who were in the neighbourhood while the struggle was going on, gave evidence.

The defendant stated that he had been on a shopping tour and was honestly in possession of the articles found. He denied that if he had wanted to shoot the constable he would have killed him.

The case was committed for trial at the Supreme Court.

**SUPREME COURT.**  
IN BANKRUPTCY.  
(Before His Honour Mr. Fielding Clarke, Acting Chief Justice.)  
Monday, April 6.

IN THE MATTER OF CHAU CHU SHAN, A DEBENTURED BANKRUPT.

The Registrar (Mr. E. J. Akeroyd) said Chau Chu Shan was adjudicated last week on his own petition and was ordered to attend to-day for examination. The bankrupt did not appear to his name.

Mr. Denmy, who appeared for him, said he was afraid the bankrupt was not in attendance. A friend of the bankrupt had informed him (Mr. Denmy) that he was afraid to come as he might be arrested. Of course his Lordship had said that the bankrupt should be arrested on coming up for examination.

His Lordship said he should make an order for the man's immediate arrest. He asked Mr. Denmy if he could assist the Court by information as to the bankrupt's whereabouts.

Mr. Denmy said he did not think he could do that, but the bankrupt was not within his Lordship's jurisdiction.

His Lordship if he is out of the jurisdiction I think you should induce him now to come back.

Mr. Denmy said he should be happy to do so if his Lordship would grant the man protection for a certain time.

His Lordship said the Court laboured under great difficulties in this Colony in a matter of this kind.

Mr. Denmy said there was an execution out against the bankrupt, and he was afraid of being arrested on that.

Mr. Wotton, who appeared for creditors, said he had two executions out against the bankrupt, but the bankrupt, in whose hands they were, had special instructions not to touch the man on his way to the Court.

His Lordship said that for the facilities for getting away from the Colony there would be no doubt about the way in which the case would be dealt with—the man would be brought up and punished for contempt of Court for not appearing.

Mr. Denmy said he was of course did not seek to justify the bankrupt's absence.

His Lordship said he had no doubt the man wanted to avoid examination.

Mr. Wotton said he might have communicated with his solicitor and got advice. Mr. Denmy said his client had already been told that he would not be arrested in coming to Court, but he could get no assurance that he would not be arrested afterwards.

His Lordship said he should put the law in force so far as he could and order a warrant for his arrest to issue. He asked if the person from whom Mr. Denmy got his information was in Court.

Fung Kwai, the person in question, came forward, and, being declared, was examined by his Lordship. He said he was a student and knew the bankrupt. He last saw him in Macao, on 20th April. He had told Mr. Denmy clerk to-day in Court, in reply to questions, that the bankrupt had not come and that he was afraid of being arrested. He (the witness) had come to Court to-day because the bankrupt had borrowed \$300 from him. The bankrupt had been on an assignment of debt to him at Mr. Webster's office on the 22nd April. Witness had not been pressing the bankrupt for money.

The case was adjourned.

**IN SUMMARY JURISDICTION.**  
(Before Mr. A. G. Wise, Acting Police Judge.)  
Monday, May 5.

SHIRAZEE S. CHO LIU CHAI.  
This was an action by a book on a contract which he negotiated between the defendant and Messrs. Roa Brothers, which

contract the broker guaranteed on behalf of the defendant, and the present claim (for \$742) was for monies paid by the broker to Messrs. Roa, on behalf of the defendant.

Mr. Hastings of Messrs. Wotton and Denmy (Office) appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. Rees for the defence.

His Lordship, in giving judgment, said the case for the plaintiff as stated by himself and the witnesses was that on the 6th July last, Roa Brothers sold 60 sugar shares through him to the defendant Choi Lip Chi, and that when he took the said note signed by the defendant to Messrs. Roa Bros. they refused to take it. The plaintiff stated that he took the note back to Choi Lip Chi and that it was agreed between them that he (the plaintiff) should guarantee the contract, which satisfied Roa Bros. On the due date the defendant failed to take the shares, which were sold by Roa Bros. and the plaintiff on his guarantee for the difference. A compromise was made, however, by a payment in cash and two promissory notes, one of which had been paid. The plaintiff, Shirazee, now said that Choi Lip Chi for the money he had paid under this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by this compromise, and the question for the court was whether on this contract the defendant was liable. If his Lordship believed Shirazee's statement he would be inclined to think the defendant would be liable; but he did not believe that Shirazee ever took the money back by



## Mails.

**NORDDEUTSCHER LLOYD.**  
NOTICE.  
STEAM FOR  
SINGAPORE, COLOMBO, ADEN,  
SUZ, PORT SAID,  
BRINDISI, GENOA,  
ANTWERP, BREMEN & HAMBURG,  
PORTS IN THE LEVANT, BLACK  
SEA & BALTIC PORTS;  
ALSO,  
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOSTON,  
BALTIMORE, NEW ORLEANS,  
GALVESTON & SOUTH AMERICAN  
PORTS.  
THE COMPANY'S STEAMERS WILL CALL  
AT SOUTHAMPTON TO LAND PASSENGERS  
AND LOGGERS.

N.B.—Cargo can be taken on through bills  
of lading for the principal ports in  
RUSSIA.

ON WEDNESDAY, the 14th day of May,  
1890, at 4 p.m., the Company's  
Steamship **DAYERN**, Capt. T. N. N. N.,  
with MALES, PASSENGERS, SPECIE,  
and CARGO, will leave this port as above,  
calling at Genoa.

Shipping Orders will be granted till  
noon, Cargo will be received on board  
until 4 p.m., Specie and Parcels until 3  
p.m. on the 14th May. (Parcels are not  
to be sent on board; they must be left  
at the Agent's Office). Contents and  
Value of Packages are required.

The Steamer has splendid accommodation  
and carries a full complement of  
For further Particulars, apply to  
**MELCHERS & Co.,**  
Agents.

Hongkong, April 14, 1890. 694

## U. S. MAIL LINE.

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP  
COMPANY.

THROUGH TO NEW YORK, VIA  
OVERLAND RAILWAYS, AND TOUCHING  
AT YOKOHAMA, SAN FRANCISCO.

THE U. S. Mail Steamship **CITY OF  
PEKING** will be despatched for San  
Francisco, via Kobe and Yokohama, on  
SATURDAY, the 10th May, at 11 p.m.,  
taking Passengers and Freight for Japan,  
the United States, and Europe.  
Through Bills Lading issued for trans-  
portation to Yokohama and other Japan  
Ports, to San Francisco, to Atlantic and  
Inland Cities of the United States, via Over-  
land Railways, to Havana, Trinidad, and  
Demerara, and to ports in Mexico, Central  
and South America, by the Company's and  
connecting Steamers.

Through Passage Tickets granted to  
England, France, and Germany by all  
trans-Atlantic lines of Steamers.

First-class Fare granted as follows:—  
To San Francisco ... \$225.00  
To San Francisco and return ... 393.75  
To Liverpool ... 325.00  
To London ... 330.00

To other European ports at proportionate  
rates. Special reduced rates granted to  
Officers of the Army, Navy, Civil Service,  
and the Imperial Chinese Customs, to be  
obtained on application.

Passengers by this Line have the option  
of proceeding overland by the Southern  
Pacific and connecting Lines, Central Pacific,  
Northern Pacific or Canadian Pacific  
Railways.

Passengers who have paid full fare, re-  
embarking at San Francisco for China or  
Japan (or vice versa) within one year will be  
allowed a discount of 10%. This allowance  
does not apply to through fares from China  
and Japan to Europe.

Freight will be received on board until 4  
p.m. the day previous to sailing. Parcel  
Packages will be received at the office until  
5 p.m., same day; all Parcel Packages  
should be marked to address in full; value  
of same is required.

Consular Invoices to accompany Cargo  
destined to points beyond San Francisco,  
in the United States, should be sent to the  
Company's Offices in Sealed Envelopes,  
addressed to the Collector of Customs at San  
Francisco.

For further information as to Passage  
and Freight, apply to the Agency of the  
Company, No. 504, Queen's Road Central.  
**C. D. HARMAN,**  
Agent.

Hongkong, May 3, 1890. 722

CANADIAN PACIFIC STEAMSHIP  
COMPANY.

TAKING CARGO AND PASSENGERS  
TO JAPAN, CANADA, THE  
UNITED STATES, AND EUROPE,  
VIA

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY  
AND OTHER CONNECTING  
RAILWAY LINES & STEAMERS.

THE British Steamship **PANTHER**,  
3,127 Tons Register, Capt. W. L. L.,  
will be despatched for VANCOUVER,  
B.C., and NAGASAKI, JAPAN, on THURSDAY,  
the 15th May, at Noon.

To be followed by the S.S. **BATAVIA**,  
on the 12th June, and S.S. **ARYSINIA**,  
on the 3rd July.

Connection will be made at Yokohama  
with Steamers from Shanghai and Japan  
Ports, and at Vancouver with Pacific Coast  
Ports, by the regular Steamers of the  
Pacific Coast Steamship Company and  
other Steamers.

Through Passage Tickets granted to Eng-  
land, France, and Germany by all trans-  
Atlantic lines of Steamers.

First-class Fare granted as follows:—  
To Vancouver/Victoria, (Mex.) \$210.00  
To Montreal, New York, &c. 290.00  
To Liverpool ... 325.00  
To London ... 330.00

To other European ports at proportionate  
rates. Special reduced rates granted to  
Officers of the Army, Navy, Civil Service,  
and the Imperial Chinese Customs, to be  
obtained on application.

Passengers who have paid full fare, re-  
embarking at San Francisco for China or  
Japan (or vice versa) within one year will be  
allowed a discount of 10%. This allowance  
does not apply to through fares from China  
and Japan to Europe.

Consular Invoices to accompany Cargo  
destined to points beyond San Francisco,  
in the United States, should be sent to the  
Company's Offices, addressed to the Collector  
of Customs, San Francisco.

For further information as to Passage  
and Freight, apply to the Agency of the  
Company, No. 504, Queen's Road Central.  
**C. D. HARMAN,**  
Agent.

Hongkong, April 29, 1890. 787

## Mails.

**NOTICE.**  
COMPAGNIE DES MESSAGERIES  
MARITIMES.  
PAQUEBOTS POSTE FRANCAIS.  
STEAM FOR  
SAIGON, SINGAPORE, BATAVIA,  
COLOMBO, PONDICHERY,  
MADRAS, CALCUTTA, ADEN, SUZ,  
PORT SAID,  
MEDITERRANEAN AND  
BLACK SEA PORTS, ALEXANDRIA,  
MARSEILLES, AND PORTS  
OF BRAZIL, AND LA PLATA;  
ALSO  
LONDON, HAVRE AND BORDEAUX.

ON THURSDAY, the 8th May,  
1890, at Noon, the Company's  
S.S. **YANGTSE**, Commandant Lemaire,  
with MALES, PASSENGERS, SPECIE,  
and CARGO, will leave this Port for the  
above places.

Cargo and Specie will be registered for  
London as well as for Marseilles, and ac-  
cepted in transit through Marseilles for the  
principal places of Europe.

Shipping Orders will be granted till  
noon. Cargo will be received on board until 4  
p.m., Specie and Parcels until 3 p.m. on the  
7th Instant, 1890. (Parcels are not to  
be sent on board; they must be left at  
the Agency's Office). Contents and Value of  
Packages are required.

The Steamer has splendid accommodation  
and carries a full complement of  
For further Particulars, apply at the  
Company's Office.

**G. DE CHAMPEAUX,**  
Agent.

Hongkong, May 1, 1890. 820

## STEAM FOR

SINGAPORE, PENANG, COLOMBO,  
ADEN, ISMAILIA, PORT SAID,  
MALTA, GIBRALTAR, MARSEILLES,  
BRINDISI, TRIESTE, VENICE,  
PLYMOUTH AND LONDON.

ALSO,  
BOMBAY, MADRAS, CALCUTTA  
AND AUSTRALIA.

N.B.—Cargo can be taken on through bills  
of lading for BATAVIA, PEKIN, SINGAPORE,  
GULF PORTS, MARSEILLES,  
TRIESTE, HAMBURG, NEW YORK  
AND BOSTON.

SPECIE ONLY LANDED AT FLYMOUTH.

THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL STEAM  
NAVIGATION COMPANY'S Steamship  
**THAMES**, Captain W. A. S. S.,  
R.N.R., with Her Majesty's Mail, will be  
despatched from this port for LONDON via  
BOMBAY and SUZ CANAL, on THURSDAY,  
the 15th May, at Noon.

Cargo will be received on board until 4  
p.m. Parcels and Specie (Gold) at the Office  
until 4 p.m. on the day before sailing.

Silk and Valuables for Europe will be  
transhipped at Colombo; Tea and General  
Cargo for London will be conveyed and  
BOMBAY without transhipment, arriving one  
week later than by the ordinary direct  
route via Colombo.

For further Particulars regarding  
FREIGHT and PASSAGE, apply to the  
PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL STEAM NAVI-  
GATION COMPANY'S Office, Hongkong.

The Contents and Value of Packages are  
required to be declared prior to shipment.  
Shippers are particularly requested to  
note the terms and conditions of the Com-  
pany's Black Bill of Lading.

Passengers desirous of insuring their bag-  
gage can do so on application at the Com-  
pany's Office.

This Steamer takes Cargo and Passengers  
for MARSEILLES.

**E. L. WOODIN,**  
Superintendent.

P. & O. S. N. Co.'s Office,  
Hongkong, April 30, 1890. 812

Occidental & Oriental Steam-  
Ship Company.

TAKING CARGO AND PASSENGERS  
TO JAPAN, THE UNITED  
STATES, MEXICO, CENTRAL AND  
SOUTH AMERICA, AND EUROPE,  
VIA

THE OVERLAND RAILWAYS,  
AND  
ATLANTIC & OTHER CONNECTING  
STEAMERS.

THE Steamship **OCEANIC** will be  
despatched for San Francisco, via  
Yokohama, on THURSDAY, the 22nd  
May, at 1 p.m.

Connection being made at Yokohama  
with Steamers from Shanghai and Japan  
Ports.

All Parcel Packages should be marked to  
address in full; and same will be received  
at the Company's Office, until 5 p.m. the  
day previous to sailing.

First-class Fare granted as follows:—  
To San Francisco ... \$225.00  
To San Francisco and return ... 393.75  
To Liverpool ... 325.00  
To London ... 330.00

To other European ports at proportionate  
rates. Special reduced rates granted to  
Officers of the Army, Navy, Civil Service,  
and the Imperial Chinese Customs, to be  
obtained on application.

Passengers by this Line have the option  
of proceeding overland by the Southern  
Pacific and connecting Lines, Central Pacific,  
Northern Pacific or Canadian Pacific  
Railways.

Passengers who have paid full fare, re-  
embarking at San Francisco for China or  
Japan (or vice versa) within one year will be  
allowed a discount of 10%. This allowance  
does not apply to through fares from China  
and Japan to Europe.

Consular Invoices to accompany Cargo  
destined to points beyond San Francisco,  
in the United States, should be sent to the  
Company's Offices, addressed to the Collector  
of Customs, San Francisco.

For further information as to Passage  
and Freight, apply to the Agency of the  
Company, No. 504, Queen's Road Central.  
**C. D. HARMAN,**  
Agent.

Hongkong, April 29, 1890. 800

## Intimations.

**THE EAST HONGKONG PLANTING  
COMPANY LIMITED.**  
NOTICE is hereby given to Holders of  
Shares in the above Company on  
which Calls are still unpaid, that unless said  
Calls with INTEREST at the rate of 12 1/2  
per Annum, from the due dates are PAID  
on or before the 15th day of MAY NEXT,  
at the Company's Offices, 6, 10a House  
Lane, the Shares in respect of which such  
Calls were made will be liable to be forfeit-  
ed, and under the Provisions of Article X  
Sub-section VIII of the Articles of Association,  
the Board will pass the necessary Reso-  
lutions for the forfeiture of the said Shares.  
**GIBB, LIVINGSTON & CO.,**  
Agents.  
Hongkong, April 28, 1890. 794

**CHAS. J. GAUFF & Co.,**  
Chronometer, Watch & Clock Makers,  
Jewellers, Gold & Silversmiths.  
NAUTICAL, SCIENTIFIC AND  
METEOROLOGICAL  
INSTRUMENTS.

VOYAGERS' CELEBRATED  
RINGULARS and TELESCOPES.  
RICHIE'S LOGS and OTHER COMPASSES.  
ADMIRALTY and LIME LIGHT CHARTS.  
NAUTICAL BOOKS.

English Silver and Electro-Plated Ware.  
Christie & Co.'s Electro-Plated Ware.  
GOLD & SILVER JEWELLERY  
in great variety.

**D I A M O N D S**  
AND  
**D I A M O N D J E W E L L E R Y.**  
A Splendid Collection of the Latest LONDON  
PATENT, at very moderate prices. 732

**HONGKONG AND WHAMPOA DOCK  
COMPANY, LIMITED.**

SHIPMASTERS and ENGINEERS are  
respectfully informed that, if upon  
their arrival in this Harbour, NONE of  
the Company's FOREIGNERS should be at  
hand, Orders for REPAIRS if sent to the  
Head Office, No. 14, Praya Central, will  
receive prompt attention.

In the event of Complaints being found  
necessary, communication with the Under-  
signed is requested, when immediate steps  
will be taken to rectify the cause of dis-  
satisfaction.

**D. GILLIES,**  
Secretary.  
Hongkong, August 25, 1889. 1435

**DEPARTURE.**  
FIRST CLASS WORKMANSHIP.  
MODERATE FEES.

**MR. WONG TAT-POH,**  
Surgeon Dentist.  
(Formerly Licensed Apprentice and Lat-  
tely Assistant to Dr. Rogers.)

At the urgent request of his European  
and American patients and friends,  
has TAKEN THE OFFICE formerly oc-  
cupied by Dr. ROGERS.

**REMOVED.**  
TO  
18, D'AGUILAR STREET,  
behind HONGKONG CLUB.

**CONSULTATION FREE.**  
Hongkong, January 18, 1890. 122

**SHARE LIST. QUOTATIONS—MAY 5, 1890**

Stocks	No. of Shares	Value	Paid- up	Closing Quotations, Cash.
--------	------------------	-------	-------------	------------------------------

Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corp.	10,000	\$125	all	\$119 1/2, prem., sales
Marine Insurance Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$250	all	\$50 \$125, ex div.
China Insurance Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$333 1/3	25	\$71
China Life Insurance Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$1,000	20	nominal
North China Insurance Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$200	all	\$50 \$125, ex div.
Straits Insurance Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$100	20	\$20
Union Insurance Society Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$250	all	\$25 \$100
Yangtze Insurance Association, Ltd.	10,000	\$25	all	\$10

China Fire Insurance Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$100	20	\$85, buyers
Hongkong Fire Insurance Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$250	all	\$50 \$125, buyers
Straits Fire Insurance Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$100	20	\$15, buyers

Fire and Marine Insurance Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$100	20	\$14
Shanghai Insurance Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$100	20	\$14

Hongkong and Shanghai Dock Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$125	all	\$53 1/2 prem., sellers
China and Japan S. S. Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$300	all	\$105
Douglas Steamship Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$20	all	\$62, sellers
H. K. & N. S. S. Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$20	all	\$36, buyers
Indo-China S. S. Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$20	all	\$25 1/2, all, sellers
Steam Launch Company, Limited.	10,000	\$20	all	\$36, buyers

Gloucester Sugar Company, Limited.	10,000	\$15	all	\$216, buyers
Liverpool Sugar Company, Limited.	10,000	\$15	all	\$87

H. K. & N. S. S. Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$20	all	\$70
Hongkong Land Investment and Agency Company, Limited.	10,000	\$100	all	\$50
Kowloon Land and Building Company.	10,000	\$60	all	\$30 \$17, buyers
Peak Building Company.	10,000	\$70	all	\$70
Richmond Terrace Building Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$100	all	\$20 \$20, nom.
Shanghai Land Company.	10,000	\$50	all	\$20 \$20, nom.
West Point Building Co., Limited.	10,000	\$50	all	\$20 \$20, nom.

H. K. High-Level Tramways Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$125	all	\$125
Jebeu Mining & Trading Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$400	all	\$4
Penang & Singapore S. S. Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$100	all	\$11, sellers
Mining Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$50	all	\$3, sellers
Sichuan Tin Mining Company, Limited.	10,000	\$20	all	\$57
Societe Francaise des Charbonnages du Tonkin.	10,000	\$20	all	\$375, nom.

China-Borneo Company, Limited.	10,000	\$750	all	\$50
Darvel Bay Trading Company, Ltd.	10,000	\$400	all	\$40
East Home Planning Co., Limited.	10,000	\$400	all	\$20, nominal
Lat Pau Planning Company, Limited.	10,000	\$400	all	\$20, nominal
Southern Railway Planning Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$400	all	\$20, nominal
H. G. Brown & Co., Limited.	10,000	\$400	all	\$20, nominal
The Lanang Planting Co., Limited.	10,000	\$400	all	\$20, nominal

Austin Arms Hotel and Building Company, Limited.	10,000	\$400	all	\$25 1/2, dis.
Hongkong Hotel Company, Ltd.	10,000	\$400	all	\$200
Peak Hotel & Trading Co., Limited	10,000	\$400	all	\$20, nom.
Borneo Hotel and Stores Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$400	all	\$20, nom., ex div.

A. S. Watson & Co., Limited.	10,000	\$60	all	\$21
Crickland & Co., Limited.	10,000	\$60	all	\$15, sellers

H. K. & N. S. S. Co., Limited.	10,000	\$10	all	\$13 1/2, sellers
Hongkong Electric Co., Limited.	10,000	\$10	all	\$68, cash
Green Island Cement Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$20	all	\$33
Hongkong Brick & Cement Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$20	all	\$17, \$15, nom.

A. G. Gordon & Co., Limited.	10,000	\$20	all	\$20, nom.
Campbell, Moore & Co., Limited.	10,000	\$20	all	\$11
Geo. Fenwick & Co., Limited.	10,000	\$20	all	\$22 1/2, nominal
Hongkong Dairy Farm Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$20	all	\$12, nom.
Hongkong Ice Company, Limited.	10,000	\$20	all	\$100, sellers
Hongkong Rope Manufacturing Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$20	all	\$110, buyers
Marine Bank Furniture Co., Ltd.	10,000	\$20	all	\$67

Chinese Imperial 1881	\$1,304,700.14	500	8 1/2 p. annum	\$ 2 prem., nominal
" " 1884	\$1,504,700.14	500	8 1/2 p. annum	\$ 2 prem., nominal
" " 1888	\$1,704,700.14	500	8 1/2 p. annum	\$ 2 prem., nominal

Hongkong Hotel Mart	\$400,000.00	500	6 1/2 p. annum	\$50
---------------------	--------------	-----	----------------	------

Hongkong Hotel Mart	\$400,000.00	500	6 1/2 p. annum	\$50
---------------------	--------------	-----	----------------	------

Hongkong Hotel Mart	\$400,000.00	500	6 1/2 p. annum	\$50
---------------------	--------------	-----	----------------	------

Hongkong Hotel Mart	\$400,000.00	500	6 1/2 p. annum	\$50
---------------------	--------------	-----	----------------	------

Hongkong Hotel Mart	\$400,000.00	500	6 1/2 p. annum	\$50
---------------------	--------------	-----	----------------	------

## Intimations.

**THE HONGKONG HIGH LEVEL  
TRAMWAYS COMPANY,  
LIMITED.**  
NOTICE is hereby given to Holders of  
Shares in the above Company bear-  
ing the following Numbers:—  
484, 511/520, 561/565, 571/580, 611/620,  
681/690, 771/785, 791/810, 961/990,  
1021/1040, 1071/1080, 1111/1115,  
1121/1125, 1165/1170, 1200/1210,  
1225/1230 and 1230/1230,  
on which the Second Call of \$50 per share,  
due 31st July, 1889, is still unpaid, and that  
unless the said Call, with interest at the  
rate of 9 per cent. per annum, be PAID to  
the HONGKONG & SHANGHAI BANKING COR-  
PORATION, or the GENERAL MANAGERS at the  
Company's Office, Nos. 50 & 52, Queen's  
Road Central, on or before the 17th MAY,  
1890, the Shares will be liable to be forfeited.  
**MICHEWEN, FRICKEL & Co.,**  
General Managers.  
Hongkong, April 24,